IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

OIPATY.'S DOCKET: HARTAL=1B

In re Application of:

Dov HARTAL et al.

Appln. No.: 09/449,093

Date Filed: 11/24/99

For: NATURAL COLORING PRODUCTS)

) Sart Unit: 1761

Examiner: C. Sherrer

Washington, D.C.

October 30, 2000

MONDAY

REPLY: RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Honorable Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

Replying to the restriction requirement Office Action of September 29, 2000, Paper No. 5, applicants Compares Transported Figure 1-28, without prejudice and without traverse.

Applicants accept that the claims of the respective groups I and II are patentably distinct from one another, i.e. each defines prima facie non-obvious subject matter from the other consistent with the definition of "patentably distinct" appearing in MPEP § 802.01. The standards of obviousness being the same (1) for patentable distinctness for purposes of restriction and (2) under section 103, applicants respectfully request the PTO to use the same standard in evaluating

11-1-00 Ow applicants' invention against the prior art, i.e. applicants request the PTO to not use a double standard.

In view of the election of group I without traverse, applicants hereby authorize the Examiner to cancel claims 29-40 (of course without prejudice to applicants' rights, including those rights provided by sections 121 and 120 to proceed without any penalty with a divisional application directed to the non-elected subject matter) by Examiner's Amendment if the present application is otherwise in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully await the results of an examination on the merits, and respectfully request favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Βv

Sheridan Neimark

Registration No. 20,520

SN:jaa

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197 Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

F:\,M\MAKH\Hartel1B\Pto\Restriction reply 30oct00.doc



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: Dov HARTAL et al

Application No.: 09/449,093

Filed: 11/24/99

For: NATURAL COLORING PRODUCTS



Art Unit: 1761

Examiner: C. Sherrer

Washington, D.C.

Atty.'s Docket: HARTAL=1B

OR

OR

Date: October 30, 2000

THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is a [XX] REPLY: RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT in the above-identified application.

- [] Small entity status of this application under 37 CFR 1.9 and 1.27 has been established by a verified statement previously submitted
- [] A verified statement to establish small entity status under 37 CFR 1.9 and 1.27 is enclosed.
- [xx] No additional fee is required.

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

	(Col. 1)	(Col. 2)	(Col. 3)				
	CLAIMS REMAINING · AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NO. PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA EQUALS			
TOTAL	* 28	MINUS	** 40				
INDEP.	* 7	MINUS	*** 7				
FIRST PRI	IRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEP. CLAIM						

	SMALL ENTITY							
		RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE					
]	х	9	\$					
_]	х	40	\$					
_]	+	135	\$					
ADDITIONAL FEE TOTAL			\$					

 ADDITIONAL

 RATE
 ADDITIONAL

 FEE

 X
 18

 X
 80

 +
 270

 TOTAL
 \$

- If the entry in Col. 1 is less than the entry in Col. 2, write "0" in Col. 3.
- ** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid for" IN THIS SPACE is less than 20, write "20" in this space.
- *** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid for" IN THIS SPACE is less than 3, write "3" in this space.

The "Highest Number Previously Paid For" (total or independent) is the highest number found from the equivalent box in Col. 1 of a prior amendment of the number of claims originally filed.

[XX] Conditional Petition for Extension of Time

If any extension of time for a response is required, applicant requests that this be considered a petition therefor.

[] It is hereby petitioned for an extension of time in accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a). The appropriate fee required by 37 CFR 1.17 is calculated as shown below:

	Small Entity			Other Than Small Entity			
		Response Filed Within	Respon	se Filed W			
		[] First - \$ 55.00	[]	First	- \$ 110.00		
		[] Second - \$ 195.00	[]	Second	- \$ 390.00		
		[] Third - \$ 445.00	[]	Third	- \$ 890.00		
		[] Fourth - \$ 695.00	[]	Fourth	- \$ 1390.00	70	
		Month After Time Period Set	Month A	After Time I	Period Set	-	
		[] Less fees (\$) already paid for month(s) extension	on of time on		·	NOV 700	
ſ]	Please charge my Deposit Account No. 02-4035 in the amount of \$_	·			至一品	
[1	Credit Card Payment Form, PTO-2038, is attached, authorizing payer		12			
(]	A check in the amount of \$ is attached (check no.).			VED 2000 - ROO	

X] The Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge any additional fees which may be required in connection with the application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-4035. This authorization and request is not limited to payment of all fees associated with this communication, including any Extension of Time fee, not covered by check or specific authorization, but is also intended to include all fees for the presentation of extra claims under 37 CFR §1.16 and all patent processing fees under 37 CFR §1.17 throughout the prosecution of the case. This blanket authorization does <u>not</u> include patent issue fees under 37 CFR §1.18.

BROWDY AND NEIMARK

Attorneys for Applicant(s

By: Sheridan Neimark

Registration No. 20,520

Facsimile: Telephone: (202) 737-3528 (202) 628-5197